



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/597,899	04/23/2007	Darrell H. Reneker	089498.0489.US	7701
39905	7590	03/15/2010	EXAMINER	
Joseph J. Crimaldi Roetzel & Andress 222 S. Main St. Akron, OH 44308			BOWMAN, ANDREW J	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER			
1792				
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE			
03/15/2010		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/597,899	Applicant(s) RENEKER ET AL.
	Examiner ANDREW BOWMAN	Art Unit 1792

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 October 2009.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 13-31 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) 19 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 13-18,20-25 and 29-31 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) 26-28 is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/06)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 10/4/06, 10/10/06

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 13-31 remain pending in the current application with claim 19 being withdrawn.

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election with traverse of the election of species in the reply filed on 10/7/09 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that the examiner would inherently have to search all of the subject matter of the independent claims from which the claims that require an election of species is claimed. This is not found persuasive because in searching, the examiner will search for the most specific details of the most specific claims (i.e. the specific coating method) instead of all coating methods that meet the limitations of a broad claim. This form of searching time and time again locates the most specifically related art. As such, if the examiner searches electrospinning, he will not necessarily find gas jet fiber coating because they are known to be different.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 13-15, 18, 20, 22, and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Chase (USPGPub 2004/0159609).

- a. Regarding claims 13, 14, 18, 22, 23Chase teaches that it is known to electrospin polymeric fibers (paragraph [0034]) through a liquid medium to be deposited on a filter substrate (paragraph [0008] and abstract) wherein the fibers are pushed through, into, and around holes in the filter to form a buildup.
- b. Regarding claim 15, Chase teaches the use of fluid jet (paragraph [0030]).
- c. Regarding claim 20, it is the position of the examiner that the fibers are deposited from solution based on the description of the process and the equipment used, therefore the polymer must be at a temperature capable of doing so.
- d. Regarding claim 29, it is the position of the examiner that the prior art meets the limitations of the claim, wherein the first side is the same as the second side, there would be at least some attraction/adhesion of the fibers to the filter and of the fibers to each other based on the materials that are used, and there no detail given to define a "joint", therefore it is determined by the examiner to be a point where two materials meet.

3. Claims 22, 24, 25, and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by Greenhalgh et al. (USPGPub 2003/0195611).

- e. Regarding claim 22, 24, and 25, Greenhalgh teaches that it is known to deposit fibers by electrospinning onto a stent (abstract). It is the position of the examiner that based on the size of the fibers being deposited an the way in which the fibers are drawn onto the stent, that fiber would be attracted to both the interior and exterior surfaces of the stent and for fibers to get to the interior

surface of the stent they would have to be pulled through an opening in the outer portion of the stent by attractive forces.

f. Regarding claim 30, Greenhalgh further teaches melting the deposited fibers onto the stent (paragraph [0178]).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

6. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to

consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

7. Claims 16, 17, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chase (USPGPub 2004/0159609) in view of Lee et al. (USPGPub 2002/0100725)

g. Regarding claim 16 the teachings of Chase are as shown above. Chase fails to teach the specific use of polypropylene nanofibers (although it should be noted that Chase does say that "virtually any material capable of being electrospun might be employed to create and introduce nanofibers according to the particular preferred invention...." paragraph [0034]). However, Lee teaches that it is known to use electrospun fibers as filters (paragraph [0004] and [0077]) and lists materials that can be electrospun in order to do so is given by Lee, wherein he lists polypropylene (paragraph [0029]). Therefore it is the position of the examiner that one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to use the polypropylene nanofibers that would be created by the combination of techniques and materials of Chase and Lee because Lee shows that they are suitable for the purposes of Chase.

8. Claim 31 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Greenhalgh et al. (USPGPub 2003/0195611) in view of Treat et al. (USPGPub 0073205).

h. Regarding claim 31, the teachings of Greenhalgh are as shown above. Greenhalgh is silent as to methods that can be used to provide heat to a stent.

However, Treat shows that a common way of heating stents is by using a heating element (paragraph [0052]), which is the most common and obvious way of heating most things in general (i.e. ovens, heaters, hot plates, and etc.)

Therefore it is the position of the examiner that it would be considered obvious to heat the stent of Greenhalgh with the heating elements of Treat because they are shown to be suitable for such purposes,

Allowable Subject Matter

9. Claims 26-28 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ANDREW BOWMAN whose telephone number is (571)270-5342. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday (7:30 to 5:00)EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Barr can be reached on 571-272-1414. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Michael Barr/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1792

Andrew J Bowman
Examiner
Art Unit 1792
